REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008 ("Office Action"). In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-56 for at least the following reasons.

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-56 are currently pending in the present application, with claims 1, 26, and 42 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 26-28, 32, 37, 38, 42, 45, and 47 are hereby amended. Claims 10, 17, 18, 22-25, 27, and 49 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein, thus rendering the rejections to these claims moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action on pages 2-7 claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,314,425 to *Serbinis* et al ("Serbinis") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2005/0071673 to *Saito* ("Saito").

While respectfully disagreeing with the propriety of the outstanding rejection, Applicants have amended the claims in attempt to advance prosecution and move the application towards allowance.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) requires that there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. The prior art references, when combined, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants

respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 11-16, 19-21, 26, 28-48, and 50-56 are allowable for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for providing network access comprising:

identifying an available network resource coupled to a network, wherein an available network resource comprises a resource coupled to the network that has unused processing capability and a network resource used simultaneously by a user;

providing an access token to the available network resource, the access token operable to allow an application of the available network resource to access a portion of the network, wherein providing the access token to the resource comprises providing access to the application of the available network resource, the application operable to perform a specified task by an administrator;

tracking the status of the access token;

providing a task associated with the access token, wherein the completion of the task terminates the access token;

maintaining a task status for the task associated with the access token;

terminating the access token, wherein the terminating comprises revoking the access provided by the access token; and

updating the status of the access token after the access token is terminated;

wherein the user has an access level unrelated to the access token.

(*emphasis added*).

Claim 1 is allowable over the proposed combination of Serbinis and Saito. Neither Serbinis nor Saito, when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest *providing an access token to the available network resource, the access token operable to allow an application of the available network resource to access a portion of the network, wherein providing the access token to the resource comprises providing access to the application of the available network resource, the application operable to perform a specified task by an administrator.*

The Office Action acknowledges that Serbinis fails to teach "the network resource coupled to a network and the access token operable to allow an application of the available network resource to access a portion of the network." (see Office Action, pg. 3). The Office Action asserts that "Saito teaches networked computers or terminals that have access to secure information ... [and] it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Serbinis to include a computer which is part of a network that allows access to other portions of the network by using access token of Saito because access token helps individual, to gain access to a particular secure component, area or information..." (see Office Action, pages 3-4). Applicants respectfully assert that Saito does not cure the acknowledged deficiency of Serbinis because Saito does not teach or suggest an access token that allows an *application* to access a portion of the network. At best, Saito teaches providing network access to a user upon receipt of a user's access code (Saito, paragraph [0014]). It follows that the alleged combination of Serbinis and Saito does not allow an application of a network resource to access a portion of a network.

Further referring to claim 1, neither Serbinis nor Saito, when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest *providing a task associated with the access token, wherein the completion of the task terminates the access token* or *maintaining a task status for the task associated with the access token.* The Office Action alleges that "Serbinis further teaches tracking the status of the access token [col. 21, lines 30-51; tracking corresponding to storing]." At best, the cited portion of Serbinis teaches checking the validity of an access code (Serbinis, col. 21, lines 30-31). In Serbinis, there are no tasks associated with an access code because Serbinis is directed to user access, not access of an application (*see e.g.*, Serbinis, col. 21 lines 20-21). Serbinis therefore fails to teach or suggest *providing a task associated with the access*

token, wherein the completion of the task terminates the access token. Serbinis also fails to teach or suggest *maintaining a task status for the task associated with the access token.* Saito, relied upon for providing access to portions of a network, does not cure the deficiencies of Serbinis. The combination is thus deficient with respect to these elements of the claim. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-9, 11-16, and 19-21 depend from claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination of Serbinis and Saito. Claims 2-9, 11-16, and 19-21 are therefore allowable as being dependent from allowable claim 1.

Independent claim 26 recites the following:

A directory user secured account system, comprising:

an access token, the access token operable to provide access to at least a portion of a network, *wherein the access token is operable to allow an application resident on the at least one available network resource to access the at least a portion of the network*;

an administrator, the administrator operable to identify at least one available network resource, provide the access token to the at least one available network resource, and store a status corresponding to the access token; and

a database, the database operable to maintain the status corresponding to the access token (*emphasis added*).

Independent claim 26 is allowable over the proposed combination of Serbinis and Saito. Neither Serbinis nor Saito, when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest an access token *operable to allow an application resident on the at least one available network resource to access the at least a portion of the network.*

The Office Action acknowledges that Serbinis fails to teach "the network resource coupled to a network and the access token operable to allow an application of the available network

resource to access a portion of the network." (see Office Action, pg. 3). The Office Action asserts that "Saito teaches networked computers or terminals that have access to secure information ... [and] it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Serbinis to include a computer which is part of a network that allows access to other portions of the network by using access token of Saito because access token helps individual, to gain access to a particular secure component, area or information..." (see Office Action, pages 3-4). Applicants respectfully assert that Saito does not cure the acknowledged deficiency of Serbinis because Saito does not teach or suggest an access token *operable to allow an application resident on the at least one available network resource to access the at least a portion of the network.* At best, Saito teaches providing network application to a user upon receipt of a user's access code (Saito, paragraph [0014]). It follows that the alleged combination of Serbinis and Saito does not allow an application of a network resource to access a portion of a network. For at least these reasons, claim 26 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 28-41 depend from claim 26 As discussed above, claim 26 is allowable over the cited combination of Serbinis and Saito. Claims 28-41 are therefore allowable as being dependent from allowable claim 26.

Independent claim 42 recites the following:

A system for a directory secured user account, comprising:

an access management module operable to generate at least one access token, the at least one access token comprising a unique identifier;

a resource communication module operable to transmit the at least one access token to a resource coupled to the network,

wherein the resource communication module is further operable to receive notification from the resource that the resource has available processing capability,

wherein the resource communication module is further operable to transmit a task to the resource, wherein the task is specific to a first application resident in the resource;

a token management module operable to maintain the status of the at least one access token and the resource; and

a database operable to store the status of the access token and the resource

(*emphasis added*).

Independent claim 42 is allowable over the proposed combination of Serbinis and Saito. Neither Serbinis nor Saito, when taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest a *resource communication module ... operable to transmit a task to the resource, wherein the task is specific to a first application resident in the resource*. The Office Action alleges that "Serbinis further teaches tracking the status of the access token [col. 21, lines 30-51; tracking corresponding to storing]." At best, the cited portion of Serbinis teaches checking the validity of an access code (Serbinis, col. 21, lines 30-31). In Serbinis, there are no tasks associated with an access code because Serbinis is directed to user access, not access of an application (*see e.g.*, Serbinis, col. 21 lines 20-21). Serbinis therefore fails to teach or suggest a *resource communication module ... operable to transmit a task to the resource, wherein the task is specific to a first application resident in the resource*. Saito, relied upon for providing access to portions of a network, does not cure the deficiencies of Serbinis. It follows that the alleged combination of Serbinis and Saito fails to render claim 42 obvious.

Claims 43, and 45-56 depend from claim 42. As discussed above, claim 42 is allowable over the cited combination of Serbinis and Saito. Claims 43, and 45-56 are therefore allowable as being dependent from allowable claim 42.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they may be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that a personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Prompt and favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe that no fee(s) are due for the entry of this paper. However, in the event any variance exists in the calculations, Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit any such variance to undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Dated: June 26, 2008

By: _____
Daniel G. Vivarelli
Registration No.: 51,137

Patrick L. Edwards
Registration No.: 57,650

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)